



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Congress have made an unusually strong stand for limitation, a number of members of the Naval Committee itself having presented a minority report against the building of two additional battleships. The protests against further naval increase have been almost as remarkable in other countries. The government of Japan, we are glad to announce, has taken steps for an actual and substantial reduction in its naval expenses. Though the prophecies of coming war between our own country and Japan are still heard occasionally, it is reassuring to be able to say that on the whole the Japanese war craze has materially died away, the utterances of both the governments and of prominent men in both countries having made it perfectly clear that real danger of war between the two nations has existed only in the imaginations of the prophets of ill omen.

THE FUTURE OF THE MOVEMENT.

While the past year has recorded no very striking events in the progress of the cause of peace, it is certain that the movement has nevertheless made very substantial gain. This gain has been most marked in the enlargement and strengthening of public peace sentiment throughout the civilized world. The demand of civilized humanity for an international system for the adjustment of controversies among the nations without resort to war has never before been uttered with so much emphasis and with such general unity among thinking men. Whenever a controversy arises, the talk is no longer of war, but all eyes turn at once to the Court of Arbitration at The Hague. A permanent International High Court of Justice, for which the peace pioneers pleaded so ably three-quarters of a century ago, never seemed so near realization as at the present time. The great armaments, which are more and more exhausting the resources of the peoples, are under constant arraignment by the general public mind and conscience. The organization of the world in a way to secure coöperation of all the powers, great and small, in the common interests of men of all races and classes hardly seems any longer a simple ideal. The Hague Conferences have made it in some substantial measure an actual fact, and already the eyes of the world are turning to the third Hague Conference, which is only about five years away, with the desire and the expectation that the third world assembly will carry to completion at least a considerable number of the great measures with which the last meeting at The Hague dealt. The roots of militarism are still deeply fixed in the laws and customs of our time, but the indications point clearly to a day relatively not far away when the world shall be delivered from this barbarous, irrational and immensely wasteful system which has come up to us out of the ignorant and savage past. The nearness of the goal of our hopes and labors must, in the very nature of the case, stimulate all the friends of peace, not only in our own Society, but in all the other peace organizations, to redouble their energies and to put forth every possible effort for the consummation of the prophecy of the Hebrew seer that the time will come when "nation will not lift up sword against nation, neither will they learn war any more."

On behalf of the Board of Directors,

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, *Secretary.*

No Further Increase of the Navy Needed.

Address of Hon. Richard Bartholdt of Missouri on the Navy Bill in the House of Representatives on March 25.

Mr. Chairman: In the last three or four Congresses I have consistently voted for one additional battleship at each session, on the theory that every year one ship goes out of commission, and that by an annual addition of one our navy will always be kept at its momentary strength. I propose to pursue the same course with respect to the pending bill, believing as I do that for purposes of defense our present naval forces are fully adequate, and in fact would be equal to all possible emergencies, even if no addition whatever were voted at this time. From every standpoint a further increase of armaments seems to me both inadvisable and unnecessary. We are at peace with all the world, and, what is more, we enjoy the confidence and respect of all governments and nations, and even if any unforeseen international complication should arise, I believe the enlightened sentiment of this country to be strong enough to-day to compel its peaceful settlement by arbitration. The annual Japanese war scare, which comes so regularly,—in fact, too regularly to be accidental,—has lost its terror and appears the less effectual the more we compare our naval strength with that of Japan.

But even if we did not have twice the number of battleships, we know that that Oriental country wants to be, and is, sincerely our friend, so that we can safely say no trouble will ever threaten us from that source as long as reason and good common sense, which fortunately are now guiding the destinies of the two nations, are not supplanted by mob rule. Consequently, from the view point of national security, there is at this time no excuse for increased naval expenditures,—and this is the only ground upon which they ever could be excused,—while, upon the other hand, there is every reason for the practice of the strictest economy at a time when corporation and income taxes have to be imposed upon the people to make both ends meet in the national household, when the expenditures of the government still exceed the revenues, and when the sustenance of life is more expensive than ever before. Already the legitimate activities of the government for peaceful development have to be restricted in order to meet the present vast expenditures for needless war preparations, and a further increase might easily mark the limit of the people's patience.

A great metropolitan newspaper said the other day: "America now has the opportunity to lead the world to peace or war." This is literally true, Mr. Chairman. It is true because by now calling a halt to further unnecessary naval expansion we shall set an example which, in the interest of peace and economy, the tax-paying millions of other nations will force their governments to emulate, while a continuance of our warlike preparations will, and inevitably must, some day lead to actual war. It may therefore be fairly said that at this particular juncture of the world's history the American Congress holds the decision of peace or war in the hollow of its hand. It is a great opportunity, gentlemen of the House, and, you will agree, it is one that rarely comes to mortal man.

Peace or war? Can there be any doubt in the mind

of any true American which it should be? Yet you wonder why the honor and glory of such a decision should rest with the United States? I will tell you the reason in the language of an unknown essayist whose tongue is more eloquent than mine: "We are at peace," he says. "We profess peace. And yet we prepare for war." To-day over four millions of men are confined to the routine drudgery of barracks, while millions more labor to support them. The increase of armaments goes on until it means "slow destruction in time of peace or swift destruction in the event of war." An ominous hush hangs over Europe. In the silence we can hear the clang of the hammer in the shipyard as bolt by bolt and beam by beam the mighty engines of destruction take shape.

And in a confused, discordant manner arises the discontent of millions who, robbed of the very necessities of life, strive in vain to keep together body and soul. The royalty of Europe, living in the glory and pride of the past, watching each other with envious eye, cannot or will not hear the cry of defenseless humanity against the awful burdens of taxation crushing out its very life. Shall that cry be forever unheeded? Is there no one to raise a voice against the awful tyranny of war? Has America no share in this world problem? Shall she stand idly by and view with unconcern, or even vie with monarchs in the creation and growth of mighty armies and mightier navies, until the whole world becomes a vast earthquake of destruction? Does she feel no throb of pity, no call of love to lighten the burdens of militarism? America is consecrated to liberty. She is the home of freedom. At Lexington, at Saratoga, and at Valley Forge Americans proved that their ideal of freedom was no passing fancy. And when their ideal was realized at Yorktown they made justice the corner-stone of the Constitution which they dedicated to liberty. Why may not America lead in the movement for peace? The same spirit of justice and freedom points us to our duty, leads us onward to our mission. The nations of Europe cannot lead. America must lead. [Applause.] Europe is a centre of entangling alliances and inherited feuds; America is alone surrounded by three thousand miles of ocean on either side. Europe is scarred by marks of countless conquests; America's virgin prairies are blessed with peaceful industry. Europe has an inheritance of militarism; America has a birthright of freedom.

The states of Europe are separated by selfishness; the Commonwealths of America are united in love. Surely we are people chosen to teach mankind a lesson of justice and lead the nations in the way of brotherhood. These are the reasons, gentlemen, why the decision of that momentous question rests with us. And, Mr. Chairman, this is not a party question. Rampant militarism respects neither individual Presidents nor individual parties. Disregarding party lines and politics, it shrewdly places its insatiable demands upon the high ground of national duty and patriotism, and upon that plane you will have to meet them, not as politicians, but as statesmen. Nor has this question, as formerly, been made a test of loyalty to the administration; and thanks for that. It leaves the way open to an individual conception of patriotism, and enables each man to vote his honest convictions. And from the standpoint of personal conviction I say again, if at this particular juncture Congress votes for a

further increase of armaments it will deal a deathblow to the hopes of the toiling millions the world over [applause], for its action will signalize a continuance of the mad rivalry of the powers, a rivalry which at the end and after the sacrifice of billions is bound to leave the relative strength of the nations exactly the same as at the beginning, as we all full well know. If, on the other hand, the American Congress calls a halt here and now, the command will be heard and heeded the world over. [Applause.] The voice of the people everywhere is for lasting peace; but unless the Congress of the United States speaks the redeeming word, it will not be spoken, for the simple reason that in a democracy alone the voice of the people can find free and untrammeled expression.

It is true that since the Spanish-American war military influences have become most powerful in our country, too, and much more so than is conducive to the health of a republic; but, thank the Lord, these influences cannot as yet control Congress. Whenever that time should come, the republic will fall and be supplanted by a monarchy with the "man on horseback" in control. Therefore, I say, let us now stop aping war lords and royalty, and no longer follow their false maxims.

You are telling the people that battleships are not for war, but for peace, for the preservation of peace. But there is a growing doubt in the minds of many, especially those who have read history, as to whether this is true. If armaments were a guaranty for peace, why is it that the nations of Europe, though armed to their teeth, have been forced to wage so many wars? The belief is gaining ground, and the best thought of the world supports it, that there is a better way, a way vastly more economical and humane, to preserve the peace, and that is by simple agreements to keep the peace. The people have seen a new light on this subject, and are satisfied that battleships are no longer essential to the maintenance of peace, since a world tribunal has been established for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The United States has given its assent to the establishment of this high court of nations, by which it is proposed to extend the rule of law beyond the boundary lines of the several countries and to international relations. More than that, the American delegates to The Hague have been largely instrumental in bringing about this splendid achievement, and the sole question now is, Will the governments resort to this instrument of peace, which, under the pressure of public opinion, they themselves have forged?

For one, I do not want it said of my country that it was insincere in this great international question and that it refuses to live up to its solemn agreements. You may talk about national prestige depending on the number of guns and battleships, but to my mind such prestige depends much more largely upon the honorable conduct of a nation, upon the sincerity of its purpose, and upon the virtues and virility of its citizenship. [Applause.] Nothing, in my judgment, will contribute more to the honor and glory of this republic in the eyes of the world than its plain honesty and sense of justice and the sincerity with which it adheres to its international obligations. And no one can convince me that it would be an act of sincerity to extend your one hand to the nations for a pact of common brotherhood and to keep on building engines of war with the other. [Applause.] You may answer that we are compelled to do as the others do.

This excuse would have some force if we were in the same position as the others, but you all know we are not. We can afford to be honest. Our geographical isolation is a protection which no other country enjoys, and we have it from expert testimony that each fleet, no matter how large and wherever it may come from, can be blown to atoms by our submarines before it could ever reach our shores.

The European and Asiatic powers are not so fortunate; but while this may excuse their naval armaments, why should we stubbornly insist on sharing their misfortunes by imposing upon ourselves unnecessary burdens, instead of aiding them, because of our position of providential isolation, in lightening theirs? He must be feeble-minded indeed who cannot glean from this the lesson of America's greatest mission in the politics of the world. [Applause.]

It is possible, Mr. Chairman, that the American people have been indifferent to a degree as to the exactions of jingoism; aye, the unthinking may even have felt flattered because of the alluring prospect of the United States becoming the greatest naval power on earth. Mistaking physical power for greatness and shallow vanity for patriotism, they always readily responded to the appeals of the jingo with that enthusiasm which is often born of a false conception of national pride. But public sentiment is rapidly changing and a better thought is getting the upper hand. If it is true what Goethe says, that man is but an animal with a soul, the tricks that stirred the animal are losing their charm, and the appeals to the soul of man are more readily heeded. [Applause.] We are learning that power is not greatness, war preparations in time of profound peace are not synonymous with honor and prestige, and that the animal spirit to fight and kill is not necessarily patriotism. In other words, we are beginning to think and reason, and the reasoning process is to the jingo what the cross is to the evil one.

I can point to a hundred facts as evidence of the growth among the people, as well as the governments, of a sentiment in favor of curbing the passions and fighting propensities of man by a regulation of the intercourse of nations in accordance with the rules of law, justice and reason, the same as obtain in all civilized countries. Last year there was a protest here of two hundred and thirty Massachusetts clergymen against further naval increases. To-day there is before us a remonstrance signed by over seven hundred ministers of churches and leaders of religious organizations from the city of Boston alone; and before I continue my argument, let me read from this remonstrance:

"We, ministers, etc., constantly made aware of the hard financial struggles of the people, due to greater cost of living, express our approval of the decrease in military and naval expenses recommended by the President in his recent annual message, and earnestly remonstrate against further increase of the navy.

"The fact that the United States, which has no enemies, but is on friendly terms with all nations, is spending more than thirty per cent. of its revenues, postal receipts not included, on preparations for war, and nearly seventy per cent. for war purposes, if the expenses of past wars be included, or nearly \$400,000,000 a year, should in our judgment cause the national government to take immediate action for the reduction of military and naval appropriations.

"We believe that the legal system already embodied in the Hague conventions is adequate to meet the requirements of

international justice on an honorable, equitable and economic basis. We therefore urge the government to use its utmost influence to encourage resort to law in all cases of international dispute and to assist in improving the legal system of the nations by all means within its power.

"We commend the efforts of the Department of State to secure the establishment of the international court of justice projected by the second Hague Conference, and we urge the employment of all practicable means for the promotion of more perfect friendship between the United States and other countries, in order that money now spent on preparations for war may be devoted to the necessities of peace and build up the prosperity of the people."

There are hundreds of other petitions from all over the United States. One from the American Peace Society, an organization with branches in all parts of the country, and members in every Congressional district, reads in part:

"We desire respectfully to express our approval of the action of the House Committee on Naval Affairs last year in reducing the number of battleships recommended from four to two; and we hereby earnestly protest against further increase of the navy this year.

"We believe that our general government, especially in view of the successful operation of the Hague peace system, where it has been faithfully tried—mediation, commissions of inquiry and arbitration—is capable of managing the international relations of this country in such a manner as to make further extensive armaments on our part unnecessary.

"Insisting upon respect for the law of nations as embodied in the international conventions made by the civilized powers at The Hague, we believe that the time has come for the United States government, which has always stood for peaceful and legal settlements of international questions, to be consistent with its traditions. We urge the government to make a serious attempt to lead the nations in limitation and reduction of armaments, in order that as soon as possible the vast sums of money now taken for their construction from the people may become available for peaceful, civic uses.

"We also express our approval of all reasonable measures that may be adopted by our Department of State for the constitution of the new international court of justice recommended by the second Hague Conference, confident that its establishment will complete the legal system of nations by giving them a court that from the nature of its structure will be accessible at all times, permanent, judicial and equitable."

I trust, Mr. Chairman, we all realize that the patriotism of those good Americans who signed these protests is not less intense because it is of a higher order than that of the jingoes. [Applause.] But let me continue my account of what is going on in the world.

A few months ago Secretary of State Knox, with the consent of the President, addressed a note to the powers proposing to invest the International Prize Court, recently created, with the jurisdiction of a court of arbitral justice. The plan was an inspiration and will immortalize its author. While the second Hague Conference had unanimously approved the principle of obligatory arbitration, as well as a continuance of the Hague Court as a court of arbitral justice with permanent judges, the question of distributing seventeen judges among forty-five nations had divided the Conference, and as no agreement could be reached, the matter was left to future diplomatic negotiations. In the meantime, an International Prize Court, with permanent judges, had been established by consent of the nations, and the American proposition, according to the Knox plan, therefore is to invest this Court with jurisdiction in arbitration as well as prize questions, and so sensible and practical is this proposition that the powers, one by one, are now signifying their assent to it. This assures us a permanent high court at The Hague

for the settlement of all controversies which the nations may see fit to submit to it. And if this institution means anything it means that every nation can have its rights protected by law and judicial decision, and that armaments are no longer necessary except for the enforcement of the court's decrees. [Applause.]

Is any one to believe that our State Department did not realize this logic and did not draw the same conclusion when it sent its circular note containing that proposal to all the nations of the earth? And does not the Navy Department, by its insistence on further naval increase, and more so by its latest fantastic plan of leading the world in naval construction (I refer to the proposed \$18,000,000 Dreadnoughts), actually repudiate our Department of State and negative, not to say give the lie to, its peaceful professions? And would not Congress, by approving the new naval program, serve notice on the world that the American proposition heretofore mentioned was not made in good faith, and that our promises, official though they may be, are mere pretense and sham? The honor of the American nation is involved in this matter, much more than in any difficulty which may cause a jingo to shout for war, and I plead for its vindication. [Applause.]

But let me continue my enumeration. The federation of the world is by many still considered as a beautiful dream. Yet it is a reality, and has been ever since the nations met for the first time at The Hague and in solemn council made laws for all the people of the earth. These laws are aimed at the establishment of lasting peace.

The governments one by one are officially recognizing the Interparliamentary Union, that brotherhood of law-makers now comprising over two thousand members of national legislative bodies, all united in a joint effort to have arbitration substituted for war. While no pledge of any kind has been exacted from them, and while they are free to vote as they please on questions of this kind, will it be consistent for them to vote for armaments when they know that only the will of the governments is necessary to keep the peace by resorting to arbitration?

I am glad to say that the American Congress, too, is about to recognize that organization by contributing its share toward the maintenance of its international bureau. Here is the nucleus of an international legislature to co-operate with the international judiciary, already established, for the preservation of the world's peace.

The United States has negotiated arbitration treaties with fourteen different nations outside of the Latin-American countries with which a general agreement has been entered into providing for the peaceful adjustment of all differences. In this connection it should also be remembered that The Hague treaties have relieved us from all real and fancied responsibility with regard to the debts of the governments south of us by providing that these obligations shall no longer be connected by force. Many other burdens have been lightened which we had to carry even before we had a navy worthy the name.

The United States has a "gentleman's agreement" with Japan which recognizes the mutual sphere of influence of the two powers, enables both to keep the peace, and in case of any dissensions renders easy an amicable understanding. All our differences with Great Britain are now in the process of adjustment by arbitration, and

a treaty to resort to the Hague Court in certain contingencies is in force between the two great powers.

There is the strongest possible evidence, Mr. Chairman, not only of the desire on the part of the governments to reduce armaments, if the United States were to make the start, but also of their positive disinclination to go to war even under strong provocation. In the British, French and Japanese Parliaments, and even in the German Reichstag, representatives of these governments recently gave assurances of their readiness to reopen negotiations for the reduction of naval armaments, and motions to that effect are pending in nearly all the parliaments of the world.

Since the Russian-Japanese war there has been no bloody encounter between the nations. It was a terrible lesson, namely, that that frightful conflict could have been avoided by arbitration the same as it was ended. The world has fairly staggered under a perception of this fact. And what has happened since? While the English jingoes shouted for war on account of the Dogger Bank incident, the governments of Great Britain and Russia ordered an investigation, as a result of which explanations followed and trouble and bloodshed were avoided. Then the Morocco affair was settled at an international conference. France and Germany referred the Casa Blanca incident to the Hague Court, and both governments have since accepted the verdict of that tribunal. In the Balkans, where there always has been enough inflammable material to set Europe on fire, even a radical change of the map could not induce the interested nations to draw the sword, while in former years much more trivial causes would have surely brought on war.

Yet to-day the preparation of nations for war is much greater than ever before. Why, then, do they not fight? Why their eagerness to investigate and arbitrate instead of summoning their battalions to battle? It is nothing else but the power of an enlightened public opinion which is determining their course, the strong and growing sentiment against that relic of barbarism, the killing of men, and in favor of a higher order of things. [Applause.] The autocrats of the world may rule their subjects, but that sentiment, born of civilization and humanity, rules the rulers. Will we Americans, living as we do in a democracy where the people themselves are supposed to rule, disregard it?

The saying is, "Where there is a will there is a way." For eighteen hundred years the human family looked in vain for a way to more permanent peace, until it was finally discovered; and what a wonderfully simple way it is! To lay it bare in all its simplicity, I will cite a historical precedent which is so instructive as to merit mention in all our schoolbooks on history. The coast line between Canada and the United States from the St. Lawrence River to Lake Superior is about two thousand miles long. In the year 1812 there were forty-six forts, big and little, on the United States side, and about the same number frowned on us from Canada. At Fort Niagara alone there were at one time six thousand troops. Altogether we had on the Great Lakes over a hundred craft devoted to the act of fighting — in the interest of peace, of course. Suddenly, but very quietly, two men got together in Washington and made an agreement. One man was Acting Secretary of the State Richard Rush of Philadelphia; the other was Charles Bagot, Minister to

the United States from England. The document is written on one side of a single sheet of paper, and is dated April 28, 1817. It can be seen in the archives of the State Department. It reads as follows:

"1. The naval forces henceforth to be maintained upon the Great Lakes shall be confined to the following vessels on each side:

"2. On Lake Ontario, one vessel not to exceed one hundred tons burden, carrying not more than twenty men and one eighteen-pound cannon.

"3. On the Upper Lakes, two vessels of same burden and armed in a like way.

"4. On Lake Champlain, one vessel of like size and armament.

"5. All other armed vessels to be at once dismantled, and no other vessel of war should be built or armed along the St. Lawrence River or on the Great Lakes."

This agreement has religiously been kept for ninety-three years. Its effect was to at once stop work on the fortifications and cause disarmament along the Great Lakes. So far as is known, the agreement will continue for all time.

Here is an example for our friends, the jingoes, to study. It is a complete refutation of their theory that a lack of armaments invites invasion and attack. On the contrary, it is a safe prediction that if these forts on the frontier had been maintained, and had the ships of war continued to sail up and down the Great Lakes, nothing short of a positive miracle would have saved us from fighting, and from a war with England. And now I ask you, what is there in the way of a similar agreement between all the nations? Only the will of the governments and rulers. [Applause.]

Selfishness, envy and fear have so far prevented them from choosing this avenue of relief and lifting from the people's shoulders a burden under which they all groan. Is America — free, majestic, isolated America — to be baffled by the same petty impulses? Mr. Chairman, it is just one hundred years ago that the world's peace movement was born, and its birthplace was the United States. I could not imagine a more glorious celebration of its centennial than by a declaration of the American Congress, through its vote on the pending bill, that this free and mighty republic, relying on its international agreements for the settlement of its differences, and believing its present armaments to be ample for defense, has once for all called a halt to further wasteful expenditure for their enlargement. [Applause.] It will mean sunshine and prosperity on this hemisphere and the dawn of a new emancipation on the other. [Prolonged applause on both sides of the Chamber.]

The Inexcusable Growth in the Cost of Our Naval and Military Establishments.

From the speech of Hon. James M. Slayden of Texas on the Naval Appropriation Bill in the House of Representatives April 8, 1910.

MR. SLAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk this extract from a speech by the late Justice Brewer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"It may be said that notwithstanding such a treaty a nation may repudiate the agreement to arbitrate and attack us, but

the public opinion of the world is strong against any nation that repudiates its treaty obligations, and public opinion is today the most powerful force in the world. We have recently voted to restore to our coinage the motto 'In God we trust.' If we can trust Him as the guarantor of our dollars, may we not also trust him to make good the international agreements for peace?

"Again, when the navy bill was before Congress the nation was stirred with the scare of a possible war with Japan. I cannot help noticing how conveniently this scare appears. In the old almanacs it was often stated, 'About this time of year look out for a great storm'; and so in our political almanacs it may as well be stated that about the time of year we are considering the question of an increase in the army or navy we may look for a great hue and cry about a probable war with Japan."

MR. SLAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, that voice from the grave of a great man, whose death came as a loss to the country within the week, will serve, when Members comprehend the full significance of his speech, to bring them to an appreciation of how great that loss was. Justice Brewer always stood for sanity, for religion, for everything that tends to enoble man and to elevate the nations of the earth. For years he stood as a bulwark, fighting only with the aid of his great intellect and high character against this wild expansion of the armament of his country, which is now, I regret to say, engaged in a hopeless and insane competition with the military nations of Europe.

He saw, as it would seem to me every man ought easily to see, that there does not obtain in this country the same reasons for large armies and great navies that do in the countries of Europe, where each nation is in immediate proximity to a potential, if not an actual, enemy. Believing, as he did, that there was a better way of preserving the peace than by shooting it into the nations of the world, he struggled for years with his mighty voice and powerful reason to advance the cause of arbitration, which has been so ardently supported on this floor by our colleague from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt]. The expense of the armed policy of peace, the wickedness of it, appealed to him always, and never during the last ten years of his life did he fail on any occasion that presented itself to stand up for what was right as between man and man and between nation and nation and to enter his protest against this monumental folly.

Others have noted, what did not escape the observation of Justice Brewer, that coincidental with the consideration of the naval bill we unfailingly have a renewal of these alarms of war. That prophet of evil, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], who is as amiable and peaceful in private as he is fearful in public life, always on these occasions sets our nerves on edge by openly predicting an assault from the Japanese, or darkly hinting at an attack from some European country. Sometimes one, sometimes the other, is put forward as the most imminent danger. The Japanese, being farther away, of a different race, and altogether a more mysterious factor, are usually the favorite enemy. Either is a good enough enemy for the purpose of those gentlemen who think, under their revised catechism, that the chief end of the mass of men is to pay for the support of those who hold commissions in the army and navy, make armor plate, and build ships.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that if great and selfish commercial interests were not behind this movement for an expansion beyond the requirements of a defensive navy, the program of the Secretary of the Navy, as newspapers call it, the whole expensive scheme would speedily collapse.